

**CITY OF ANNA MARIA
COMMISSION WORK SESSION
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
JULY 24, 2006
10:00 A.M.**

CALL TO ORDER (10:05 A.M.)

PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL: Mayor SueLynn, Commissioner Christine Tollette, Commissioner Dale Woodland, Commission Chair John Quam, Deputy Commission Chair Linda Cramer, Commissioner Duke Miller

Also present: Tony Arrant, AICP – Institute of Government, Florida State University (Facilitator & Planning Consultant); Fran Barford (Chairperson, Planning & Zoning Board [a.k.a. Local Planning Agency (LPA)])

Press: Sun (10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.), Islander (10:30 – 11:30 a.m.)

1. INITIAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN REVIEW SESSION

Chair Quam invited Fran Barford to take the floor. The P&Z Chairperson, addressing the Commission on behalf of the Board, thanked the Ad-Hoc Committee, the City staff, Tony Arrant, and the citizens of Anna Maria for their assistance in the review and preparation of the proposed revisions contained in the hard copy document she was now presenting for further deliberation.

Fran Barford said she was proud of the teamwork her fellow Board members developed, as they deliberated the issues and listened to the citizens, to reach a consensus recommendation for the City of Anna Maria's future. She observed that, for a layperson, it was a daunting task to sit and make long-range plans for the City that would direct it ten to twenty years into the future. P&Z Chair Barford urged the Commissioners to listen carefully to Tony Arrant, who would be pointing out the critical issues and highlighting language that the reviewers must not change [as they are governed by Statute].

Ms. Barford noted that this review process, to this point, had taken over three years. She recommended that the City work with Mr. Arrant to streamline the Comprehensive Plan review process for the future.

A. Introduction

Tony Arrant took the floor and thanked everyone involved for their cooperative assistance and commitment to the process. He noted that the LPA [the City's P&Z Board] had worked for over a year on the document now before the Commission, in addition to their normal workload.

What is a Local Comprehensive Plan?

Tony Arrant noted that when he first arrived at the City, the whereabouts and usage of its Comprehensive Plan were uncertain. The Facilitator noted that the original plan had been written for the City by an outside agency. He explained that he had agreed to be retained by the City to assist it in producing a draft with citizen input. Tony Arrant emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan document is now the City of Anna Maria's plan, written by and for its citizens. He said that State law {F.S. Ch. 163, Part Two, passed in 1985} requires the planning horizon of this document is a minimum of ten years ahead. The Facilitator noted that every local government in the State of Florida has a comprehensive plan that it is responsible for maintaining, updating, and implementing.

Mr. Arrant clarified that the document now before the Commission was a proposed updated draft of the City's current Comprehensive Plan, revised with strikethrough and redline language. He noted that the original document had been written in 1989, and was adopted, along with the Future Land Use Map, and put into effect in 1992.

How Does the Plan Work?

Tony Arrant explained that since 1985, under current Florida law, no local government can take any action with regard to development that is inconsistent with the Future Land Use Map and the locally adopted Comprehensive Plan that had been accepted by the State. He said that every *action* that a local government takes must be consistent with the Future Land Use Map and the Goals, Objectives, and Policies contained in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Arrant offered the example of the Martin County case, where in 2002 it had issued a building permit that was consistent with its Land Development Regulations (LDR's), and in the opinion of the County Commission, consistent with its Comprehensive Plan. The permit was for a multi-phase, high-density residential development immediately adjacent to an existing, single-family residential neighborhood. Tony Arrant noted that the Martin County Comprehensive Plan contained a Policy that mandated the buffering of one land use from another, and specified the method for doing this. He said that the developer, with the blessing of the County began constructing multi-family housing immediately adjacent to the single-family neighborhood of a retired couple. They objected and filed an administrative grievance, first with the County, and then with the State. Tony Arrant indicated that the finding of the Florida Supreme Court, to whom the developer had made its last appeal, was that the developer must destroy the \$3.4 million worth of structures it had built, even though some of them were occupied.

Mr. Arrant explained that the Florida Administrative Code, written by State agencies and approved through the Administrative Procedures Act, also

governs the Comprehensive Plan. He said that F.A.C. Ch. 9J-5 lists all the minimum criteria and requirements for every comprehensive plan. Tony Arrant indicated that the pertinent statutes were on the Internet and could be found on the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) web page at My.Florida.com.

Makeup of the Plan Elements

Tony Arrant explained that a local Comprehensive Plan must consist of eight written elements, consisting of two types of language, 1) data and analysis, and 2) Goals, Objectives and Policies. The parts of the Plan that must be formally adopted and enforced by the City Commission consist of the Future Land Use Map and the Goals, Objectives and Policies of each Element.

Mr. Arrant pointed out that it would not be necessary to adopt the data and analysis portions of the Elements, noting that changes requested by public comment at the public hearings would need to pertain only to the Goals, Objectives and Policies or the Future Land Use Map.

Purpose of the Goals, Objectives, and Policies of Elements

Tony Arrant offered the following definitions:

Goal: Long-range vision for any aspect. Must be through to 2020.

Objective: Specific, measurable ‘benchmark’ that shows progress toward a goal. It must indicate what is to be done and when, so that future review can ascertain progress.

Policies: Policies or action steps are things that are to be done to achieve an objective.

Steps in the Process of Adopting the Evaluation and Appraisal Report

The Facilitator said that the Evaluation and Appraisal Report (EAR) examines the Goals, Objectives, and Policies to determine if the City has been consistent with its plan. He said that by Statute, a local government must send an EAR to the Florida Department of Community Affairs (DCA) every five years, and noted that Anna Maria was scheduled to submit one for March 2006. Tony Arrant explained that the penalty for being late with an EAR is that the City may not file any small-scale amendments to its Comprehensive Plan before the EAR is submitted.

Mr. Arrant said that it could take up to four months for the DCA to complete its review of the City’s EAR, after which it would be sent back to the City along with any comments or questions from the reviewing body. The City will then begin a public hearing process to begin to amend the language in the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1992. He referred to the flow-chart he had

prepared to illustrate the complicated processes of reviewing and amending the Comprehensive Plan.

The Facilitator confirmed to John Quam that the process of drafting changes to any part of the Plan could take place at any time, since the Plan is a dynamic document. He noted, that because the City is located on a barrier island, State legislation prevented certain aspects of the Plan from being changed. For example, in high hazard coastal areas, the density of inhabitants per gross acre cannot be increased.

Commissioner Tollette confirmed with Mayor SueLynn that this fact strengthened and supported the City's position relative to its current work on designating a Coastal Overlay district.

Review of the Process Completed by the Ad-Hoc Committee and the LPA

Tony Arrant recalled that in preliminary discussions with the Mayor in 2003, he had informed her that, since according to State law, all changes to the Comprehensive Plan and all land development regulations, the ordinances contained in the local land development codes, building codes, including sign ordinances and anything dealing with development and local government, must go through the LPA, which is Anna Maria's case is the Planning & Zoning Board. He noted that this body serves the City as an advisory board. Mr. Arrant explained that at that time, the Mayor and the Commission recognized that the workload before the P&Z Board would prevent it from performing its function in the EAR process in a timely fashion. They therefore established the citizens Ad-Hoc Committee to begin the process, and to function as an advisory committee to the P&Z Board. Tony Arrant noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee met and worked with him for the better part of two years to deliver its recommendations to the P&Z Board.

Mr. Arrant explained that the EAR is *about* the Comprehensive Plan and the Future Land Use Map; the EAR is neither the Plan nor the Map itself. Therefore, the document is a report on the Plan, while the entire Plan is a much larger document. He confirmed that he had been contracted to educate the citizen planners, City staff, and the LPA about the Plan, its purpose, legal function, and the EAR and amendment processes.

Tony Arrant described how members of the Ad-Hoc Committee each received assigned Elements to read and review. They consulted with him and received direction and assistance in interpreting, researching, validating, and updating the language and information contained in their respective elements. In addition, each committee member had been assigned a portion of the city to do a sidewalk inventory of current land use, which was mapped digitally and updated, which resulted in multiple versions of the map.

The Future Land Use Map and How it Differs From the Zoning Map

Mr. Arrant said that the survey of land use conducted by the Ad-Hoc Committee was one of the most progressive actions he had ever seen undertaken by a local government. He explained that usually the task of determining current land use is simply a function of the LPA contacting the local property appraiser's office and using that information, along with an aerial map of the city. Tony Arrant described how that data gathered by the sidewalk survey was put into a database, linked digitally with a GIS map of the City, that can now be updated on a continuous basis, should the City decide to purchase the software to do so. The City can now determine at a glance how many homes are pre-FEMA, or how many are built at grade level, how many are concrete construction, how many have two stories, etc., how many have been built since a certain date, etc. He noted that another benefit of this linked map is that the Building Department could enter building permit data and be able to turn in year-end reports that were better than the County Property Appraiser's office records.

Tony Arrant informed the Commission that the City now has citizens who are familiar with the entire Comprehensive Plan and are knowledgeable about the source and significance of the information it contains.

Mr. Arrant explained that the Zoning Map of the City is an optional component of the local Land Development Codes. He defined the Land Use Map as one required by law, that establishes the general land use designations. Tony Arrant stated that the City has the right, within a legislated land use category as designated on the Land Use Map, to adopt an ordinance that will further define what can be done on that land. He pointed out that the Zoning Code, however, cannot contain an ordinance that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Tony Arrant explained that a local ordinance could be more restrictive, but not less restrictive than state law. The zoning ordinance is part of the City's Home Rule authority, established by F.S. Ch. 166 in 1968. He pointed out that the Bert Harris Act does not apply to the special process of amending the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Arrant said that Bert Harris is a local ordinance challenge process, where a plaintiff can claim that the government has passed an ordinance that places an undue burden, and possibly limits the financial value of their property. He commented that if the Comp Plan is amended, and an ordinance is amended in a way that is consistent with the Plan, it would be very unlikely for a city to be challenged with a Bert Harris lawsuit. Mr. Arrant observed that by law, a local government has the authority to adopt regulations for the general health, safety and welfare of the community.

Mr. Arrant said that when the Ad-Hoc Committee had completed its review and the Planning & Zoning Board received its recommendations, the Board decided to review each Element separately, but as a group. He noted that

Anna Maria had one of the most progressive input policies he had ever seen, in that the public was allowed to comment at every meeting that was held.

Tony Arrant noted, relative to administrative appeal, or challenge, that the *only* thing that sets the record is public input in the public hearing, only. He observed that thus far, the City has only held one Public Hearing. Mr. Arrant noted that at that Public Hearing, roughly half of the public comment had nothing to do about the Comp Plan, and much of it dealt with re-zonings and some building code issues.

Commissioner Woodland asked if it would be necessary for those who had public input at the P&Z Public Hearing to repeat their input at the Commission's Public Hearing. Tony Arrant responded in the affirmative, noting that this is an important responsibility on the part an individual who wishes to reserve the opportunity to exercise his rights. The Commissioner asked whether any of the public input presented at EAR meetings would be included in the documentation of the process. The Facilitator explained that this input would be summarized in the report by noting that multiple workshops were held that were publicly attended. He said that the Public Hearing Minutes would become part of the transmittal for the EAR. Mr. Arrant again pointed out that the burden was on the individual, during the entire process, to register any complaint at the Public Hearing of the LPA, register it again at the Public Hearing of the governing body [City Commission], and then if relief is not achieved, to petition the State. He explained that if the Commission makes a change that beneficially affects an individual, and the DCA does not accept it and requires its removal, the affected individual's recourse would be a lawsuit against the State, not the City.

B. Determine Public Comment at Work Sessions

Tony Arrant suggested that to expedite this body's review and deliberation, it may elect not to accept public comment at these work sessions, and to inform the public that the crucial time to go on the record will be at the Public Hearing, regardless of whether or not they are heard during the work sessions.

Mayor SueLynn noted that public comment often slows things down and becomes repetitive from meeting to meeting, especially when two or more work sessions are involved. She acknowledged that the public had not represented itself at today's meeting.

The Facilitator recalled that during the advertised Ad-Hoc Committee process, which was also covered by the press, almost no one from the public attended, however Planning & Zoning Board meetings held abundant comment, most of which eroded the focus of the LPA.

Commission Chair Quam suggested allowing public comment for ten or fifteen minutes before the end of the meeting, as is current policy at regular work sessions, and there was consensus for this approach. He offered the opinion that, if members of the public are willing to sit and wait until the end of the meeting, they should be allowed to comment.

Commissioner Miller agreed, but cautioned against allowing comment after each point of discussion. He also supported the policy of clearly informing the public at each meeting of the importance that they make their comments heard at the Public Hearing, regardless of whether they were voiced at work sessions.

Mayor SueLynn asked Tony Arrant to comment on the appearance of multiple attorneys retained by individual, as well as groups of property owners. She noted that certain attorneys had requested fifteen minutes instead of three because they represented more than one person. Mr. Arrant responded that the City had no obligation to allow this extra time, and would be within its rights to inform the speaking attorney that if more than three minutes is requested, the request must be made to the City in advance.

Discuss Other Pertinent Matters of the Plan

Mayor SueLynn said that during the review process, individuals who had read Elements in detail had brought to her attention that some actions stated in the Plan had not been taken. The Mayor recommended that as the Commission reviews the LPA document, that it compile a list of such items. She noted, for example, that she had been unaware until the review process began, that a Capital Improvements Advisory Committee should have been established years before she had been elected to office.

C. Determine Order of Element Review and Begin Process

The Mayor noted that the two groups who had so far conducted the review process had used different methods of directing the meeting. She indicated that the Ad-Hoc group had not used a chairperson, and simply asked Mr. Arrant to facilitate their meetings. Mayor SueLynn noted that at the P&Z EAR meetings, where the Chairperson attempted to act as the facilitator, progress was inhibited.

Commissioner Woodland said it was his hope that before this day's meeting was adjourned, the Commissioners would be able to dedicate thirty minutes to discussing a strategy for completing the current process. He noted that the Commission could take advantage of the experience and special knowledge offered by individuals who had already been directly involved in one or both of the two preceding review processes.

Tony Arrant welcomed the Commissioner's input, stating that his intent had been to ask each individual at the table for this meeting what they would

expect to have been accomplished by the time it ended. He asked if the Commissioners would like to first review the important or unresolved issues, and towards the end of the meeting revisit some ideas.

Commissioner Miller suggested that Tony Arrant first go through the entire document and then begin the discussions of issues that required additional consideration. Tony Arrant clarified for Commissioner Quam that the LPA document now before the Commission may contain some of the changes recommended by the Ad-Hoc Committee, plus other changes determined by consensus of the LPA, but it did not necessarily include all the changes recommended by the Ad-Hoc Committee. Tony Arrant indicated that as the Commission moves through the document, he will point out changes that were made and provide the reason for it.

Mayor SueLynn said that during the review process, individuals who had read Elements in detail had brought to her attention that some actions stated in the Plan had not been taken. The Mayor recommended that as the Commission reviews the LPA document, that it compile a list of such items. She noted, for example, that she had been unaware until the review process began, that a Capital Improvements Advisory Committee should have been established years before she had been elected to office.

Tony Arrant noted that the law indicates that the chief administrator or the planning official should present an annual EAR report to the Commission, a practice that would provide management with direction for the future. He said that this could be done around budget time by the City Planner or Building Official, and in this way the City could ensure its own compliance with the Plan. The Facilitator indicated that codes should be reviewed and revised to comply with the Plan within one year of its having been amended.

Tony Arrant pointed out that someone could have asked, or could still ask today about the Recreation and Open Space trust fund, and a circuit judge, if petitioned, could in the ensuing lawsuit require the City to implement it, and also to furnish all the permit records necessary for an audit if one was requested. Mr. Arrant said that in the EAR notes to the DCA, he will say, if the City chooses to keep the language, something to the effect that the City has found that this was never implemented, but believes that it is something it wants to do, therefore it is preserving the language in the Element.

Another important concept Mr. Arrant explained was that of automatic legal standing. He said that if someone had exhausted local administrative remedies, having appeared at all the public hearings and voiced satisfaction or dissatisfaction about a specific item, he could continue to object to its adoption by filing a petition with the State of Florida Department of Community Affairs. The person would then have automatic legal standing to challenge in circuit court. Mr. Arrant described the right to legal standing in

the State of Florida as the most progressive on this continent. He emphasized that in their request for a court challenge, the person who has participated in the process is not required to prove that their position is right or wrong, nor that they have been harmed in any way. The Facilitator said that prior to 1985, there had not been a single court case where a judge allowed someone to challenge a building activity that a local government had permitted based upon a comprehensive plan or a land development code.

There was consensus to begin the review with the Future Land Use Element.

FUTURE LAND USE

Tony Arrant described the format required for the DCA transmittal version of the EAR. He said it would consist of eight chapters, corresponding with the Elements in the Comprehensive Plan, each containing an introduction and an evaluation of its Goals, Objectives and Policies. Mr. Arrant said that the final version of the EAR would include notes from him as to the reason for each and every change proposed, no matter how small.

The Facilitator indicated that the Data and Analysis for the Future Land Use Element would be attached. *He noted that the City Clerk would be obtaining the latest annual population projections from Manatee County, as provided for in the Intergovernmental Coordination Element of the Comprehensive Plan adopted in 1992.* Tony Arrant informed the Commissioners that he had done his own population projections earlier in the process, and found that the city's resident population is decreasing slightly while its seasonal population is increasing.

Tony Arrant reiterated that the Goals, Objectives and Policies are the parts of the Comprehensive Plan that the Commission will adopt by ordinance and send to the State. He said that the State must approve them or send them back with instructions for modification. The Facilitator stressed the importance of complying with the DCA's instructions, having worked in litigation directly for the top administrators of that department in Tallahassee. He observed that the State does not back down from its directives and has yet to lose a case in this arena of affairs.

The Facilitator noted the "Measures" headings in this section had been stricken, and advised the Commission not bind itself by adopting these by ordinance, since measures for success are subject to change. He noted that it is for this reason that the State does not require the adoption of the Data and Analysis sections of the Elements, as data is continuously changing.

Tony Arrant said that State law requires a local government to designate a land use category for all of the land that is within its jurisdiction. He stressed that land use districts are not zoning districts. The Facilitator referred to the proposed Land Use Map of the city, and noted that the land use categories had changed, as a

result of the work done by the Ad-Hoc Committee. *He pointed out that the LPA had drawn his attention to the fact that the legend was incorrectly formatted, and that this would be corrected.*

Mr. Arrant said that Florida law requires that a density and intensity of use be established for each land use category. He indicated, relative to ***Policy 1.2.1***, that the 5.8 and 8.7 residential units per gross acre were most likely based upon lot sizes of 5,000 sq. ft. and 7,500 sq. ft. Tony Arrant noted that medium density residential had been removed and described how the Ad-Hoc Committee and the LPA had arrived at the conclusion that institutionalizing fractions of density would be impractical in the future development environment.

Tony Arrant noted that the maximum residential density had been revised to 6 units per gross acre, and that as the review process continued, he recognized growing concern about the treatment of existing non-conformities. Mr. Arrant said he therefore worked with the LPA to draft a policy that would grandfather everyone's land use as it is used today.

The Facilitator returned the Commission's attention to the current and the proposed Future Land Use Maps and pointed out changes in the Commercial and ROR colorations and boundaries. He said that it would be important, relative to future growth, for the Commissioners to understand the distribution, the extent, and the timing of the designated uses.

Tony Arrant noted that the two previous reviewing committees had difficulty protecting the residential character of the city while attempting to preserve the small amount of existing commerce as a benefit to residents.

At 12:00 p.m., the Work Session recessed for lunch and the meeting resumed at 12:35 p.m.

Mayor SueLynn commented that she felt it was important to preserve a small amount of commerce for the convenience and benefit of local residents, and expressed concern that the current revision of the Comprehensive Plan did not include much support for the Commercial area.

Referring to ***Policy 1.3.5***, and mixed use or Residential / Office / Retail (ROR), Tony Arrant noted that Pine Avenue, from a planning perspective was intended to be the city's 'downtown'. He noted that the Ad-Hoc Committee had agreed, as did the judge in a case that was ongoing at the time, that the intent of the adopted Comprehensive Plan was to limit structures to two floors, but that was not what this particular policy said.

Tony Arrant pointed out that the ROR land use district now extends down Gulf Drive, according to the proposed Future Land Use Map. He told the

Commissioners to expect public comment differing in opinion about the change in the dynamic of that street this could cause.

Commissioner Miller recommended that people who have a general comment, such as that Commercial land use is not being adequately supported, be asked to suggest a possible solution. Tony Arrant noted that the Chair of the LPA had requested that members of the Board who felt this way to write something that could be voted upon, otherwise the language would need to be passed onto the Commission. **There was consensus for members of the Commission to draft suggested changes or additions and submit them in writing to the City Clerk so that these could be addressed at future meetings.**

Relative to *Policy 1.3.6*, Tony Arrant noted that the City's land development codes have always been more restrictive than its Comprehensive Plan. He noted that usually, floor area ratios, not height restrictions, are written into Comprehensive Plans, and that this may elicit comments from the DCA. Mr. Arrant explained that the LPA was attempting to protect existing neighboring residences. He pointed out that this would make the building at Galati's non-conforming. The Facilitator added that this Policy would also have the effect of encouraging residential development and discouraging commercial development. Commissioner Miller noted that close to 100% of the city's Commercial land use is adjacent to Residential land use.

Tony Arrant noted that *Policy 1.3.8* had been stricken at his suggestion, and the Commissioners agreed. He explained that *Policy 1.3.9* was not new language, however, it had been moved from the section where it had been incorrectly placed. Relative to *Policy 1.3.10*, he noted that Conservation areas basically consist of the beaches, and that there are more restrictions to development and use in Conservation areas than in Preservation areas.

Mr. Arrant informed the Commissioners that the time to bring language relating to the Coastal Overlay District into the Comprehensive Plan would be when the City drafts and adopts its amendments.

Tony Arrant noted that a density for Recreation and Open Space land use needed to be established, and that the question had been how to deal with the Community Center. He said the reason that he did not require the LPA to pursue deliberations relative to density was that the DCA did not require a Comprehensive Plan to include a Recreation and Open Space Element.

The Facilitator noted the importance of the addition of *Policy 1.4.1*, and indicated that this protection of existing land use was not actually contained in the Comprehensive Plan today, even though it was present in the City's less restrictive LDR's. He said that even though State law says that non-conformities are to be discouraged, the City's argument for this Policy is that it preserves the single-family village character of the community.

Tony Arrant noted, relative to **Policy 1.9.3**, requiring the contribution of developers toward the cost of new recreational land and facilities, that this Policy had also been contained in the Recreation and Open Space Element. *He said that the LPA had eventually directed him to strike this language, noting at the same time that it would be a policy decision on the part of the Commission.* Mr. Arrant confirmed that the language still appeared in the Capital Improvements Element. Commissioner Cramer noted that the budget contained a restricted fund Line Item for Recreation. Commissioner Woodland cautioned the Commission against forcing the City to act. He recommended striking the language and reserving the option to act as it stated.

Mr. Arrant clarified for Mayor SueLynn, relative to **Policy 1.10.1**, that the language simply meant that the three neighboring cities needed to notify one another if they are permitting a development that may impact another community, as provided for in the Intergovernmental Coordination element.

Tony Arrant indicated that he and the Mayor had been discussing the possibility of his going back, once the EAR process is completed, and developing a user-friendly guide to using the Comprehensive Plan in conjunction with the Future Land Use Map.

Mr. Arrant pointed out redundant language, beginning on Page 13, and said he would require the Commission's permission to strike out the second section.

The Facilitator proceeded to ask the Commissioners to verify that the proposed language is clear to them in relation to the proposed Future Land Use Map.

Commissioner noted that all of the motels in the city were located in the Residential district. Tony Arrant noted that motels could be built in ROR.

Tony Arrant reported that the biggest controversy among citizens appeared to be relative to the proposed extension of the ROR district down Gulf Drive, where it currently is designated for medium density residential use.

Discussion continued relative to the designation of the Bean Point area as a Conservation area, noting that no development is allowed in Conservation land use areas. Mr. Arrant pointed out that in developing the map, great care was taken to superimpose the aerial photographs to assure accuracy.

Tony Arrant stated that the only entities that have the authority to control and manage growth and implement Comprehensive Plans are the local governing bodies, which are the city and county governments, and the incorporated governing entity of Disney.

Discussion followed relative procedure for upcoming meetings. Commissioner Woodland stressed the importance of coming to the meetings prepared and limiting discussion to a short time frame, such as five or ten minutes. He reminded the Commissioners that discussions need not begin at ‘ground zero’. The Commissioner recommended taking into account Mr. Arrant’s recollection of the discussions of the two previous reviewing bodies, and beginning Commission discussion where the LPA left off. He expressed the opinion that it might be possible for the Commission to finish the review with just one more work session. Commissioner Miller agreed, and recommended that individual Commissioners comments be limited to three minutes.

Commissioner Woodland recommended that the Commissioners be furnished with copies of the P&Z minutes prior to the next work session.

DATE FOR NEXT MEETING

Monday, August 21st, 2006, from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.

Tony Arrant confirmed that any Commissioners with suggestions for a re-write would Email them by one-way memo to the City Clerk by August 16, 2006.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Cramer moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Commissioner Miller.

Vote: All Ayes. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 3:03 p.m.